

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application. Claims 1-10 are rejected.

Applicant's independent claims are amended to clarify the claimed invention. For example claim 1 includes the feature that the input data is multiplied always by the same tap factors in the same order, regardless of the change in the number of oversamples.

The claim amendments are supported by the original specification, for example Fig. 4. No new matter is entered.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 5, 9 and 10 have been amended according to the suggestion by the examiner. It is respectfully submitted the rejection is overcome.

Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by D'Luna et al. (5,311,459). (D'Luna).

It's argued in the Office Action that in Fig. 2 D'Luna shows a circuit configured to perform sequentially matrix operations including group of selectors M1, M2, M3 with one or more selectors M1 changing the predetermined number of tap factors to be selected and with the rest of the selectors (M2 and M3) in the group changing patterns of the selected tap factors because the mux control circuit is connected to all the selectors/mux.

It is respectfully submitted that the invention claimed in claims 1, 5, 9 and 10 is not disclosed in D'Luna. D'Luna fails to disclose any art in which, even in a case where the number of oversamples is changed, the input data is multiplied by tap factors that are the same as what it was before the change, and is multiplied in the same order.

In fact this cannot be achieved in D'Luna no matter how the selectors M1-M3 are controlled. This effect cannot be achieved in D'Luna because the coefficients are output from

the coefficient registers C1-C12, connected in cascade, to the selectors M1-M3. This means that in D'Luna, if the number of oversamples is changed, the continuity of the filter output cannot be maintained no matter how the selectors M1-M3 are controlled. Therefore, D'Luna does not have the features and advantages that the present claimed invention has.

Because claims 2-4 and 6-8 are dependent on the amended claims 1, 5, 9 and 10 mentioned above, when claims 1, 5, 9 and 10 are found free of rejections, claims 2-4 and 6-8 are likewise in condition for allowance.


Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over D'Luna

Because claims 4 and 8 are dependent on claims 2 and 6 which are dependent on the amended claims 1, 5 respectively, when claims 1, 5 are found free of reasons to reject, claims 4 and 8 are likewise in condition for allowance.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,


Brian S. Myers
Reg. No. 46,947

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Telephone: (212) 940-8703
Fax: (212) 940-8986/8987
Docket No.: FUJX 18.514 (100794-11669)
BSM:fd